DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 131 963 95 RC 009 522

AUTHOR Valverde, Leonard A.
TITLE Segregation, Desegregation, and Resegregation of the Spanish-Surname Student in the United States.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Aug 76
CONTRACT NIE-P-76-0163
NOTE 41p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bias; Change Strategies; Cubans; Defacto Segregation; Dejure Segregation; *Discipline; Discriminatory Attitudes (Social); Elementary Secondary Education; Integration Litigation; *Integration Methods; Latin American Culture; Mexican Americans; Promotion (Occupational); Puerto Ricans; Racial Integration; Racial Segregation; *School Integration; *School Segregation; *Spanish Speaking; Student Distribution; Student Enrollment; Student Teacher Ratio; Suspension
IDENTIFIERS Chicanos; Spanish Surnamed

ABSTRACT

Since the birth of school integration efforts in America, the mixing of children of different races and ethnicities has gone through segregation, desegregation, and resegregation. Just as the popular misbelief was that Black Americans were segregated in the South where they numerically concentrated and rarely in the North, so too the stereotypic view is that Mexican Americans are segregated in the Southwest only. The fact is that Chicanos are still habitually separated in the Northwest, Midwest, and Great Plains states. But the school segregation of the Spanish speaking population goes beyond Chicanos; it extends in numerical and geographical scope with the addition of Puerto Ricans in the Northeast, Cubans in the Southeast, and Latin Americans pocketed throughout the country. Because of the national magnitude and major impact segregation has on this population and the proportional void of recorded literature on desegregation affecting Latinos in the United States, this paper identifies resegregation processes occurring in multi-ethnic/multicultural settings in the United States where Spanish speaking students are concentrated. Topics discussed are: (1) incidence of ethnic intraschool isolation, (2) minority student discipline, (3) Spanish-surname teacher/administrator distribution, (4) selection and promotion as they impact on school and classroom environment, and (5) possible intervention strategies of a general nature. (Author/NQ)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED131963

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: RC UD
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

NOV 1976
ERIC/CRESS
RECEIVED

SEGREGATION, DESEGREGATION, AND RESEGREGATION OF THE SPANISH-SURNAME STUDENT IN THE UNITED STATES

Leonard A. Valverde
The University of Texas at Austin

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

August, 1976
Austin, Texas

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant contracted with the National Institute of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgement in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official National Institute of Education position or policy.

National Institute of Education
NIE - P - 76 - 0163

RC009522

PREFACE

Since the birth of school integration efforts in America, the mixing of children of different races and ethnicities has gone through segregation, desegregation, and resegregation. During these past twenty-two years of circular motion, many aspects of the desegregation experience have been documented by numerous authors. The literature is replete with any number of studies recording the affects and effects of desegregation on Blacks and Whites. However, there is a noticeable void of studies, reports, and other writings of school segregation and desegregation as related to the second largest discriminated group in the United States, the Spanish speaking people.

Just as the popular misbelief was that Black Americans were segregated in the South where they numerically concentrated and rarely in the North, so too the stereotypic view is that Mexican Americans are segregated in the Southwest only. The fact is that Chicanos are still habitually separated in the Northwest, Midwest, and Great Plains states. But the school segregation of the Spanish speaking population goes beyond Chicanos; it extends in numerical and geographical scope with the addition of Puerto Ricans in the Northeast, Cubans in the Southeast, and Latin Americans pocketed throughout the country (see Table I in the Appendix for Spanish-surname enrollment in public schools).

Because of the national magnitude and major impact segregation has on this national Latino population and the proportional void of recorded literature on desegregation affecting Latinos in the United States, this paper is directed toward bringing some light to this vast darkness.

In general, the goal of this paper is to identify resegregation processes occurring in multi-ethnic/multicultural settings in the United States where Spanish speaking students are concentrated. More specifically, the objectives of the paper are to discuss (1) incidents of ethnic intraschool isolation, (2) minority student discipline, (3) Spanish-surname teacher/administrator distribution; (4) selection

and promotion as they impact on school and classroom environment, and (5) possible intervention strategies of a general nature.

It is hoped and anticipated that this paper will (1) promote sponsorship by the National Institute of Education of a substantial number of research projects on desegregation as related to the Spanish-speaking students attending American public schools all across the country, and (2) stimulate researchers and educators in the identification and pursuance of pertinent questions needing special attention. With apologies for my biases, the section on "Research: Directional Focus" is offered to mark a new target area for research. It was felt that identifying a major area would be more beneficial and productive than listing a specific set of questions for investigation.

Personal appreciation is given to Dr. Amos Isaac for making this position paper a reality, and to Roberto C. Perez for acquiring elusive sources of information.

Leonard A. Valverde

Austin, Texas

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	Preface	ii
	List of Tables	v
I.	Segregation: Traditional Means	1
	A. Societal Discrimination	1
	B. Pre-Brown School Segregation	2
II.	Desegregation: Post-Brown Era	6
	A. Legal Loophole	6
	B. Cisneros: Closing the Loophole	6
III.	Resegregation: New Devices	7
	A. Intraschool Isolation	7
	B. Minority Student Discipline: Discrimination Applied	10
	C. Spanish-Surname Teacher/Administrator Distribution	16
	D. Exclusion in Promotion and Its Instructional Consequences	18
IV.	Intervention Strategies	21
V.	Research: Directional Focus	24
VI.	References	27
VII.	Appendices	31

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I	Spanish-Surname Enrollment in Public Schools by Region	32
II	Population Distribution of Spanish-Surname by Origin and by Region	33
III	Mexican Americans in Predominantly Mexican American School Districts	3
IV	Percentage Distribution of Chicanos and Anglos in Each of the Specified Ability Group Levels	8
V	Student Suspension by Race	11
VI	Twenty Worst Districts in the United States for Spanish Surname Students	13
VII	Percentage of Disciplinary Action Compared to Percentage of Minority Student Enrollment, Austin ISD, 1974 - 1975	17
VIII	Assignment of Chicano Teachers in the Southwest by Chicano Student Enrollment	34

SEGREGATION, DESEGREGATION, AND RESEGREGATION OF THE SPANISH-SURNAME STUDENT IN THE UNITED STATES

I. Segregation: Traditional Means

A. Societal Discrimination

American citizens of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Latin and, more recently, of Cuban descent, like other excluded minority groups, have intentionally been discriminated against across the spectrum, that is, in employment,[1] public accommodations,[2] administration of justice,[3] housing,[4] civil rights,[5] and education. Not only have unfair discriminatory practices covered the entire spectrum, but this national blanket of unjust behavior covers the continental United States from Puerto Ricans on the Atlantic coast, Cubans in the Southeast, the Chicanos in the Southwest, to Filipinos on the Pacific coast (see Table II in the Appendix for population distribution of the Spanish surname in the United States). In addition, derogatory treatment of the Spanish-surname American is as old as the birth of this nation. The scope and depth of societal discrimination against the Spanish speaking population is beyond documentation of this paper.† The purpose of this writing is to isolate one strand of discrimination, segregation of the Spanish-speaking†† student in public schools in the United States.

---

†For an in-depth study of each of the areas listed above, the reader is directed to the respective footnoted source.

††Throughout the text, the author will use Spanish-speaking, Spanish-surname, Hispanic, and Latino as synonyms and as umbrella terms to be inclusive of Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, Central and Latin Americans, Cubans, and Portuguese. Also, Chicano will be used interchangeably with Mexican American.

B. Pre-Brown School Segregation

While "segregation" is a term which strictly speaking refers only to the setting apart or separation of individuals, it is a practice which has resulted in the exclusion of minority students from equal education. The segregation of racial and ethnic minority children from white students in public schools has always been rooted in unfounded misconceptions better known as racist attitudes. Unfortunately, in order for society to condone this banal irrational practice, a "logical" excuse has usually been fabricated. Before the 1954 Supreme Court decision, *Brown v. School Board of Topeka, Kansas,* the segregation of black students was defended against attack on the fallacious separate-but-equal concept. In kind, a sister excuse was manufactured for the isolation of Spanish-surname students. The pre-Brown argument of segregating Latino students was based upon language deficiency.[6] The placement of Spanish-surname students unto themselves was obviously arbitrary for two reasons. One, no appropriate and systematic language assessment was applied to Spanish-speaking students for the purpose of pedagogical placement. Two, children who were Spanish-surnamed but had *no* language problem were automatically assigned to schools and classrooms composed of students of like ancestry.† Clearly, the disguise was thinly veiled! The extent of Spanish-surname student segregation is represented in Table III.

Of course, in large metropolitan centers, segregation of Hispanic students was due mostly to residential patterns that fostered racial and ethnic isolation. However, *de facto* segregation in large cities did not absolve school personnel from guilt. *De facto* segregation of Hispanic students was sustained due to school district personnel not

---

†As an example of Chicano children being assigned to classrooms based on race rather than merit, see *Hernandez v. Driscoll Consolidated ISD,* in *Race Relations* (Texas: 1957), p. 329. A Chicano child who spoke only English was denied admission to the Anglo section.

TABLE III

Mexican American Pupils in Predominantly Mexican American Districts†

	Districts 50 - 100 Percent Mexican American			Districts 80 - 100 Percent Mexican American			
	Number of Districts	Number of Pupils in Districts	Percent of Total Mexican American Enrollment in State	Number of Districts	Number of Pupils in Districts	Percent of Total Mexican American Enrollment in State	Mexican American Total State Enrollment
Texas	94	291,398	57.7	31	107,140	21.2	505,214
California	57	54,741	8.5	5	5,149	0.8	646,282
New Mexico	31	38,891	37.8	9	17,117	16.6	102,994
Arizona	15	12,125	16.9	0	0	0	71,748
Colorado	9	6,568	9.2	2	1,736	2.4	71,348
Southwest	206	403,723	28.9	46	131,142	9.4	1,397,586

NOTE: Since the Chicano is the largest subgroup in the total Spanish-speaking population and the Southwest is the most heavily Spanish-speaking populated region of the United States, the above data can be taken as representative of the entire segregation status of Latinos.

†SOURCE: Fall 1968 HEW Title VI Survey in *Ethnic Isolation of Mexican Americans in the Public Schools of the Southwest.* U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, Report I, April 1971, Table 5, page 12.

undertaking conscious remediation efforts such as heterogeneous grouping and school district rezoning.

In small to medium size rural cities, school segregation of Latinos was due more to overt action by school officials than the omissive action by school officers of large urban districts. Due to geographical proximity, residential patterns were not sufficient to separate Spanish-surname children from white students. Thus intraschool separation was accomplished *vis a vis* classroom assignment due to language deficiency. District-wide removal of Spanish-surname students from Whites

> sometimes [took] the form of an action by a school board providing that all students of a named ethnic group be registered in a given school. In other instances a school board approved the drawing of zone boundaries in such a way as to throw all families of a given ethnic group into homogeneous areas. When neither of these two methods seem[ed] feasible, a policy of transfer of students from zone to zone brought about the same results.[7]

Another effective means of separation was the weak enforcement of mandatory attendance laws. For example,

> even though Texas has a compulsory attendance law, the usual board policy in most districts was not to enforce the attendance of Mexican American children, particularly when this meant large numbers of them would attend schools with Anglos.[8]

Still another arbitrary practice of discrimination by school officials was the holding back of Chicano students in a certain grade level for two or three years. Retention at the early grades was intentional. Lack of steady promotion caused Spanish-surname students psychological and social problems (i.e., negative self-image and social awkwardness) which contributed to early drop-out from school.

The practice of supporting separate and unequal school conditions throughout the United States for Latinos was not sanctioned by any state law except in California where a state statute providing for separate schools for Mongolians and Indians was interpreted to include Mexican Americans as being in the latter category.[9]

Hence, while segregation of the Spanish-surname student in large urban cities was mostly *de facto* in nature, segregation in rural towns was *de jure*. *De jure* school segregation of the Spanish-surname American is best documented by recorded litigation.

The legal challenge against school segregation in the United States has been spearheaded by the Mexican American. Judicial opposition against school segregation goes back as early as 1930 in Texas with the *Independent School District v. Salvatierra.*[10] Salvatierra posited that the Del Rio Independent School District was separating Mexican American children merely because of their race. The school district successfully contended that the students' language deficiency warranted their separate schooling. In 1947, the Texas Attorney General issued an opinion that reinforced the language deficiency premise by ruling that linguistic deficiency justified separate classrooms and even separate buildings when necessary.[11]

California's 1946 *Mendez v. Westminister School District*[12] was the first federal court decision addressing segregation of the Mexican American. The court pronounced that separate schools with the same technical facilities did not meet the laws pertaining to equal protection. The Ninth Circuit Court reaffirmed the federal decision by finding that segregation of Chicanos denied them due process and equal protection under the law.

In Texas, where discrimination was more blatant and segregation more intensive than other states having large numbers of Spanish-speaking people, the *Delgado v. Bastrop Independent School District*[13] court decision (1948) upheld the landmark California Mendez ruling by stating that the school district practice of segregation was in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment of the U. S. Constitution. Furthermore, in Texas, where segregation of the Mexican American was more by separate schools, the court directed that separate classes for those with language deficiencies must be held on the same campus, thereby forbidding school authorities to rationalize from completely separating Chicano students into different schools based on the language deficiency proposition.

II. Desegregation: Post-Brown Era

A. Legal Loophole

Despite the advantageous ruling of Mendez and Delgado for Chicanos and *Brown v. Board of Education* for Blacks, school officials were not prevented from continuing their practice of segregating Chicanos from white students. The escape from legal compliance was found in a technicality, that is, Mexican Americans were classified as White. Consequently, in tri-ethnic settings, the post-Brown generation of desegregation saw school authorities mixing black students and Chicanos together while Whites were still assigned to all-Anglo schools. Therefore, by pairing Blacks with Chicanos and excluding Whites, the two largest minority school populations were still exposed to inferior facilities and unequal education still prevailed.

As early as 1955, this technical escape was questioned in California by parents in the El Centro School District.[14] Unfortunately, the issue was settled out of court. The major legal test occurred with *Keys v. School District Number One*[15] in Colorado in 1970. Regrettably, the Keys case also did not settle the issue of whether mixing Blacks with Chicanos produced a unitary school system.

B. Cisneros: Closing the Loophole†

It wasn't until *Cisneros v. Corpus Christi Independent School District*[16] that the technical loophole was sealed off. The Cisneros case is fundamentally significant because for the first time a court official declared Mexican Americans as an identifiable ethnic minority group for the purposes of public school desegregation. The major implication of this momentous decision was to deny school districts from (1) locating new schools in Black and Chicano neighborhoods; (2) bussing

---

†For a more detailed discussion of Cisneros and other judicial actions, see Guadalupe Salinas, "Mexican Americans and the Desegregation of Schools in the Southwest," in *Houston Law Review*, Vol. 8, No. 929.

Anglo students to avoid the minority group schools; and (3) assigning Black and Chicano teachers in disproportionate ratios to segregated schools.

III. Resegregation: New Devices

A. Intraschool Isolation

As desegregation enters into its second generation of students, ethnically balanced schools still harbor intraschool isolation. Resegregation within desegregated schools is a result of two prevalent practices: (1) homogeneous grouping based on intelligence and/or achievement test, and (2) tracking based on curriculum and/or instructional programs as well as categorical funding.

Numerous educational journals[17] and many conferences have been devoted entirely to scrutinizing standardized tests. The net effect that norm reference tests have on students who are culturally distinct from Whites, such as the Spanish-speaking youngster, is to place a high disproportionate number of them in the retarded or below-average category. The explanation for this negatively skewed representation is that standardized tests fail to measure accurately the culturally-different innate capacity for achievement by the child. The implicit premise is that standardized tests are normed to represent the average white middle-class student, hence test items are inherently biased against children who are culturally different. Aptitude and achievement scores are used for the purpose of grouping students according to like abilities. Application of norm reference tests on Spanish-surname students in concept if not in practice is denial of equal educational opportunity.

Greater discrimination is suffered by Spanish-speaking children when they are unjustly forced to take an examination in English. As a result, Latino youth who are dominate Spanish speakers score low and are placed incorrectly into Educable Mentally Retarded Classes (EMR). Chicanos in Texas are two times as likely to be placed in EMR classes as are Anglo pupils, and in California Chicanos are almost two-and-a-half times as likely as Anglos to be placed in such classes.[18] This

detrimental practice is best illustrated by the following example.

> Using the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children 44 [Mexican Americans] scored below 80 when tested in English. But when the test was administered to the same group in Spanish, only 20 scored below 80. Consequently, when applied to children with a limited background in English, these tests are inadequate since they are unable to measure a child's capacity to learn and thus result in harmful discrimination to the Mexican American child in the public schools of the southwest.[19]

Equally if not more damaging than testing is the tracking practice which has stifled the cognitive growth and affective development of racial and ethnic minority students. Tracking is defined as the placement of students into homogeneous groups for the purpose of matriculating through the grade levels. Once a student is placed into a curriculum track (a prescribed sequential instructional program) membership is constant and exit is very difficult. Standardized testing usually mislabels and locks Spanish-surname students into industrial and agricultural programs. In fact, "an analysis of schools which practice some form of ability grouping shows that Chicano students are grossly overrepresented in low ability group classes and correspondingly underrepresented in high ability group classes" (see Table IV).[20]

TABLE IV

Percentage Distribution of Chicanos and Anglos in Each of the Specified Ability Group Levels†

Percent of School Composition which is Mexican American	Student Ethnicity	Ability Group Level			
		Low	Medium	High	Total
0 - 24.9%	Chicanos	36.4%	53.6%	10.0%	100.0%
	Anglos	14.6	62.1	23.3	100.0
25.0 - 49.9%	Chicanos	36.2	55.2	8.6	100.0
	Anglos	15.5	62.6	21.9	99.9
50.0 - 100.0%	Chicanos	33.4	52.7	13.9	100.0
	Anglos	14.6	59.1	26.3	100.0

†SOURCE: U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Toward Quality Education for Mexican Americans*, Report VI, February 1974, Table 8, p. 23.

During the fifties and early sixties, the language deficiency proposition tracked limited-English-speaking students into English as a Second Language (ESL) classes. But the turbulent debate during the late sixties over standardized testing and its effects on minority students has caused tracking of students based on test scores to be minimized. Nevertheless, tracking of minority students has continued under more legitimate banners. Now, Spanish-surname students are tracked into Bilingual, Migrant, and Title I Compensatory education programs. While these infancy programs hold great promise in advancing the intellectual development of Spanish-surname students, ethnic isolation still persists because of school administrators' resistance. Many chief school executive officers hold the view that special instructional programs designed to emphasize the strengths of ethnic minority children are only productive and suited to the designated student population. This narrow administrative viewpoint is directly and indirectly transmitted to white middle class parents who, in turn, withhold their children who would benefit from learning a second language and a different culture from such an opportunity. Consequently Bilingual, Migrant, and Title I Compensatory education programs and ethnic studies programs are saturated with minority students. While this new segregation formed on a pedagogical basis goes towards promoting cognitive growth and affective development of minority youngsters, it also goes contrary to two principles of desegregation: (1) a unitary system of education and (2) social equality.

In defense of administrators advocating white student enrollment in special instructional programs designed for the culturally distinct student, it must be said that their efforts toward more mixed enrollment have been hindered due to funding allocation policy. For example, in the early stages of trying to get federal financial assistance to minority students, educators were forced to document that minority students were "educationally disadvantaged" *vis a vis* standardized achievement scores below the national median, lower grade level of school completion than white students, and "socially deprived *vis a vis*

negative concept of self and lack of displaying white cultural norms. Therefore, federal dollars earmarked for special instructional programs for minority students were restricted for these identified students.† Additionally, compensatory education programs were quickly associated with remedial instruction. Typical reaction by white middle-class parents was that they did not want their children being held back by minority students. Thus they resisted the administrators' advice about enrollment, for example, in bilingual classes.

B. Minority Student Discipline: Discrimination Applied

Two means of school discipline affect minority students adversely and disproportionately: (1) suspension and expulsion from school and (2) corporal punishment. A third means usually not associated with school discipline but generally perceived as punitive in nature, and therefore included here for discussion, is grade retention.

School segregation is best characterized as physical separation of students. A means of separating minority students from others is to physically displace them from classrooms, school extracurricular activities, and school grounds. Whereas in the past not enforcing the compulsory attendance law kept Spanish-surname students removed from white students, presently suspension and expulsion is used to minimize interaction between minority and white students in desegregated schools.

A study conducted by the staff of the Children's Defense Fund has concluded that school suspension is more a function of school policies and practices than of students' behavior.[21] Hence the claim that disproportionate suspension of minority students is due to their disproportionate misbehavior is rejected by them. They counter by stating that disproportionate suspension of minority students reflects a

---

†In the early years of Title I Compensatory education programs, HEW via state education agents found that equipment purchased with federal funds designated for compensatory education students was being assigned to non-compensatory classrooms.

pervasive school intolerance for children who are different.[22] In the mid-sixties and early seventies, school officials' intolerance was best mirrored in dress codes and hair lengths. Many black students were suspended for growing "Afros" and many Chicano junior high boys were disciplined for "showing" their shirt-tails. In general, some type of disciplinary action is taken against students for not complying satisfactorily to such school policies as not being dressed properly for gym classes, failure to pay towel fees, tardiness, mumbling, inattentiveness, possessing bubble gum, failure to say "Sir," talking without permission, not covering books, sitting on desks, and cursing.

Discriminatory discipline based on racial or ethnic prejudice and in the form of suspension is reflected in national statistics (see Table V).

TABLE V

Student Suspension by Race†

	Elementary	Secondary	Elementary and Secondary
White	36,994 (0.5%)††	434,954 (6.0%)	471,948 (3.1%)
Black	55,053 (1.5%)	337,384 (11.8%)	392,437 (6.0%)
Spanish	5,763 (0.4%)	51,639 (6.1%)	57,402 (2.7%)
Indian	470 (0.6%)	3,485 (5.6%)	3,955 (2.8%)
Asian	201 (0.2%)	1,786 (2.4%)	1,987 (1.1%)
Total Including Unidentified	119,071 (0.9%)	893,276 (8.0%)	1,012,347 (4.2%)

†SOURCE: Children's Defense Fund, *School Suspension: Are They Helping Children?* Cambridge, Mass.: Washington Research Report, 1975, Table 1, p. 63.

††Number, followed by percentage in parentheses.

While Children's Defense Fund staff, in reviewing Office of Civil Rights' statistics, confirmed that black students have the highest rate, highest frequency, and highest duration of suspension, they also noted that

> Mexican American, Puerto Rican, and Portuguese children appear to be suspended even more often than blacks. But since together they comprise 15 percent of all children surveyed and 11 percent of all suspensions of secondary students, the sample may be too small to be conclusive.[23]

In order to gauge the magnitude of discrimination in the use of suspension against Spanish-surname students across the United States, Table VI is provided.

The magnitude of discriminatory suspension of Spanish-surname students is deflated because of two conditions. First, the suspension rate for Spanish-surname children appears lower chiefly because Latino students have one of the highest dropout rates of any group. About 26.1 percent do not complete high school,[24] where most of the suspensions occur. Second, very large school districts with large Hispanic enrollment provided incomplete reports. For example, in the Office of Civil Rights' survey of Fall 1972-1973,

> Los Angeles failed to report any suspensions at all, and 23.9 percent of its school enrollment is Hispanic. New York City, where 26.6 percent of the school enrollment is Hispanic, failed to identify the ethnicity of 75 percent of those suspensions it reported. Chicago, which has a substantial (11.1 percent) Mexican American and Puerto Rican community, also failed to report ethnicity for over 28,000 suspensions.[25]

The practice of school suspension aids and abets two other resegregation means: grade retention and school exit. School suspension denies students from instructional time, causing them to lag behind in class assignments. Students who are frequently suspended are doubly penalized when they are failed, forcing them to repeat the grade level. Some districts have attendance rules which require grade retention if a child misses a certain number of days.[26] Suspensions also cause victims of grade retention and marginal or poorly motivated students to drop out of school permanently. In other cases, suspension contributes to children acquiring a juvenile arrest record by putting

TABLE VI

Twenty Worst Districts in the United States
for Spanish-surnamed Students
(Elementary and Secondary Combined)†

Rank	District Name	Number Suspended
1	Denver, Col.	1497.0
2	El Paso, Tex.	1369.0
3	Houston, Tex.	1360.0
4	Albuquerque, N.M.	1279.0
5	Dallas, Tex.	1086.0
6	East Side Union, Cal.	985.0
7	New York City, N.Y.	975.0
8	Sweetwater Union, Cal.	947.0
9	Dade Co., Fla.	939.0
10	San Diego, Cal.	891.0
11	Corpus Christi, Tex.	860.0
12	Pueblo City, Col.	827.0
13	San Antonio, Tex.	722.0
14	Bridgeport, Conn.	720.0
15	Bassett, Cal.	704.0
16	Montebello, Cal.	695.0
17	Sacramento, Cal.	564.0
18	Fresno, Cal.	549.0
19	Austin, Tex.	514.0
20	Edgewood, Tex.	485.0

†SOURCE: Children's Defense Fund, *School Suspensions: Are They Helping Children?* Table 6, p. 165.

TABLE VI (Continued)

Rank	District Name	Percent Suspended
1	Columbia Co., Ga.	100.0
2	Zion-Benton, Ill.	60.0
3	So. Gloucester Co., N.J.	44.4
4	Roseville Union, Cal.	31.8
5	No. Chicago, Ill.	31.7
6	Central Union, Cal.	30.1
7	Lower Camden Co., N.J.	29.5
8	Fremont, Ohio	29.2
9	Lemoore Union, Cal.	29.0
10	Merced Union, Cal.	25.3
11	Asbury Park, N.J.	25.3
12	Gridley Union, Cal.	25.0
13	Joliet, Ill.	24.8
14	Newport, R. I.	23.1
15	Proviso, Ill.	22.4
16	Healdsburg Union, Cal.	22.3
17	Bloom, Ill.	21.6
18	Kerman Union, Cal.	21.1
19	Oroville Union, Cal.	19.6
20	Essex Co., N.J.	19.2

Rank	District Name	Excess Number Suspended
1	New York City, N.Y.	661.5
2	Albuquerque, N.M.	551.8
3	El Paso, Tex.	486.9
4	Bridgeport, Conn.	460.9
5	San Diego, Cal.	425.4
6	Denver, Col.	423.1
7	Dallas, Tex.	389.2
8	Houston, Tex.	372.2
9	Pueblo City, Col.	363.2
10	East Side Union, Cal.	353.6
11	Sacramento, Cal.	271.8
12	Sweetwater Union, Cal.	244.6
13	Milwaukee, Wis.	216.8
14	Norwalk-LaMiranda, Cal.	178.0
15	Colorado Springs, Col.	172.6
16	Alhambra City, Cal.	171.8
17	Clovis, N.M.	165.9
18	San Jose, Cal.	159.2
19	Austin, Tex.	157.2
20	Richmond, Cal.	151.9

TABLE VI (Continued)

Rank	District Name	Percent Above White Rate
1	Columbia Co., Ga.	97.0
2	Zion-Benton, Ill.	50.8
3	So. Gloucester Co., N.J.	26.2
4	Newport, R.I.	19.3
5	No. Chicago, Ill.	18.7
6	Essex Co., N.J.	17.2
7	Asbury Park, N.J.	13.7
8	Huntington, N.Y.	13.6
9	Ukiah, Cal.	12.7
10	East Ramapo, N.Y.	12.0
11	Freemont, Ohio	11.8
12	Houston Co., Ga.	10.6
13	Penns Grove, N.J.	10.2
14	Somerville, N.J.	9.9
15	Roseville Union, Cal.	9.7
16	Sandusky, Ohio	9.6
17	Escambia, Fla.	9.5
18	Mendota Union, Cal.	9.4
19	Muscogee Co., Ga.	9.1
20	Bridgeport, Conn.	9.0

unsupervised children and those with problems onto the streets. Students charged with a certain crime are expelled from school or those having a juvenile arrest record are "pushed out" of school.

Corporal punishment, arbitrarily or unfairly applied to minority students, leads to intraschool segregation (e.g., detention hall) or school exclusion. Minority students are more prone to be identified for corporal punishment. Their visibility is pronounced by their variance with school policies (e.g., dress codes), their boredom with the "bleached" curriculum, their low-achiever or "troublemaker" label, or their poor attendance record. Application of corporal punishment is dependent upon administrative judgment. Administrators' interpretation of offenses which pertain to all children are applied unequally against minority students. In support of this claim, Table VII shows the disproportionate distribution of corporal punishment by one public school district towards Blacks and Chicanos (see Appendix). While the statistics are for only one district, other available district reports suggest that unbalanced application of corporal punishment on minority students is national in scope and the widespread discriminatory application of disciplinary sanctions is a function of administrative bias rather than student behavior.[27]

C. Spanish-Surname Teacher/Administrator Distribution[†]

The picture of segregation of Spanish-surname teachers and administrative staff is a mirror image of the Spanish-surname students. While Latino staff members are found in school districts throughout the United States, the greatest number and percent are in the Southwest. By focusing on the Chicano status in the Southwest, the Latino condition

---

[†]For an in-depth coverage of Spanish-surname teacher/administrator distribution, refer to *Ethnic Isolation of Mexican Americans in the Public Schools of the Southwest,* U. S. Commission Report I, April 1971, Chapters 3 and 4.

throughout the country can be projected with some clarity and proper proportion.

In all the southwest states where the percentage of Chicano students is the greatest, Chicanos comprise substantially less of the teaching staff (4%) than they do of the student population.[28] More than 55% of the Mexican American teachers in the Southwest are assigned to predominantly Mexican American schools (see Table VIII). Furthermore, even in predominantly Mexican American schools, Chicano teachers constitute less than one third of the total teaching staff.

TABLE VIII

Assignment of Chicano Teachers in the Southwest by Chicano Student Enrollment†

	Percent Mexican American in School				
	0 - 24.9	25 - 49.9	50 - 79.9	80 - 100	Total
Arizona	213/41.4††	138/26.8	130/25.3	33/ 6.4	514/100.0
California	2,448/66.0	622/16.5	383/10.2	275/ 7.3	3,769/100.0
Colorado	235/47.3	129/26.0	83/16.7	51/10.3	497/100.0
New Mexico	246/13.9	277/15.6	809/45.6	442/24.9	1,774/100.0
Texas	629/12.3	276/ 5.4	1,121/21.8	3,107/60.5	5,133/100.0
Southwest	3,812/32.6	1,443/12.3	2,526/21.6	3,907/33.4	11,688/100.0

†SOURCE: U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Ethnic Isolation of Mexican Americans in the Public Schools of the Southwest*, Report I, April 1971, Table 13, p. 44.

††Number of Mexican American Teachers/Percentage Distribution of Mexican American Teachers

As with classroom teachers, principals are underrepresented and segregated, except to a more severe degree. Only three percent (less than 100 total) of the principals in the Southwest are Chicanos.[29] About 65 percent of the Mexican American principals head predominantly Mexican American schools in contrast to 55 percent of the teachers and 45 percent of the students. Other professional non-teaching staff at the school building (assistant principals, counselors, librarians, nurses) are mostly found in schools of 75 percent or more Mexican American student enrollment.[30]

At the school district level, comparatively few (7%) Mexican Americans are employed as superintendents, assistant superintendents, instructional supervisors, and other professional positions. Nearly half of these people are employed by school districts that are predominantly Mexican American.

As for school board trustees, the pattern holds true to form again: substantial underrepresentation and election to school districts with high densities of Mexican Americans.

Resegregation of Hispanic educators has been justified on the language proficiency proposition. That is to say, the greatest increase in employment of Latino educators occurred concomitantly with the influx of federally supported instructional programs for the limited English speaking student. The bulk of Spanish-surname educators were hired and assigned to such positions entitled bilingual teacher, community relations specialist, director of migrant programs, coordinator of Chicano studies, etc. These positions required competency in the native language of the students and parents to be served. While staff assignment was based on programmatic function (language and cultural compatability), the unanticipated consequence was ethnic isolation.

D. Exclusion in Promotion and its Instructional Consequences

The statistics cited in the previous section illustrate not only the shortage and segregation of Latino educators across the country, but also point out the sizeable absence of Latinos in the educational

leadership sector, administration. The universal reason given by most school board members and superintendents about the dearth of promotion of Spanish-surname educators to administrative positions is their scarcity in number. The unchallenged assumption is that promotion in school districts is based on competition, that is, only the best qualified are promoted. However, recent studies on role transition[31] (e.g., teacher to principal) in schools have revealed that advancement into decision-making positions is based more on subjectivity than objectivity, on favoritism rather than competition, on informal means instead of formal procedure.

Becker and Strauss claim that movement to higher echelons within occupations depends on the extent to which the candidate has certain organizational commitments.[32] Thus, a candidate acquires acceptance into and within the administrative sector not only by learning the job skills but, more importantly, by understanding and accepting the group's expectations, its way of doing things, and its climate or culture. Edgar Schein labels this as the "price of membership."[33] Hence, for the most part, while school districts adhere to the district's formal promotional procedures to advance candidates, such action only goes to mask the informal determining process. Furthermore, while organizational socialization controlled by white male administrators has functioned effectively to include aspiring white males, it has been the major means of excluding minorities[34] and women[35] from advancement into administration.

In large school districts, promotion is based on the sponsor-protege network as documented by Griffiths' study in *Teacher Mobility in New York City*.[36] In small rural districts, promotion is also the result of sponsorship usually referred to as the "good old boy system." The critical element in sponsorship is that the aspiring candidate must behave in the like manner of the sponsor. Before the candidate is inducted into the administrator's role, he must represent and reflect the administrative sector's norms and values. This professional transformation occurring during role change has been studied by R. Blood.[37] The price for not conforming is exclusion. Mexican Americans have

resisted acculturation of whatever form, which may explain the few Latino administrators in school districts where most of the sponsors are white males. Where we do find most Hispanics in administrative positions, the district is dominated by Hispanic school trustees and superintendent.

The paucity of Spanish-surname administrators and teachers has long-lasting consequences for Latino children. First, the inadequate numbers of Hispanic educators at all levels establishes a void of role models. Without role models for youngsters to identify with, aspiration lies dormant, incentive to compete for recognition is not aroused, and hope of becoming something is nil. In short, the lack of role models affects adversely the student's ambition to strive. Second, lack of Spanish-surname teachers affects the Spanish-speaking student's learning rate. Limited-English-speaking students who have teachers who are language deficient will receive limited amounts of information. Latino students instructed by teachers unfamiliar with their cultures are frequently exposed to insensitive treatment and irrelevant curricula. In short, the insufficient amount of Spanish-surname teachers diminishes the curriculum content and the instructional delivery received by Spanish-surname students. Third, even those Spanish-surname students who are taught by Spanish-surname teachers suffer from ethnic isolation. Many of these young people seldom come into first-hand contact with other cultures, resulting in tunnel vision and a distorted view of society.

Spanish-surname teachers learning the ropes about promotion indirectly influence negatively their students' learning. Realizing that advancement is not to any great degree based on classroom excellence and open competition, Spanish-surname teachers reduce, either consciously or unconsciously, their drive to teach expertly. Ethnic minority administrators who are few in number are highly visible to fellow administrators and the general public. Feeling as if they are in a fishbowl and sensing little peer support, Spanish-surname administrators are forced to be cautious in their actions and conservative in their decisions. In short, when the education of the Latino child

requires reform, dynamic teaching, and aggressive leadership, Hispanic teachers and administrators are constricted to maintaining traditional education, reserved teaching, and passive leadership.

IV. Intervention Strategies

Segregation of racial and ethnic children based on unfounded prejudice has been with public schools for many years. Practices producing this discriminatory action are well documented, and the logistical knowledge to eradicate this unfair and harmful process is equally available. That is to say, doing the reverse moves segregated districts to desegregated ones. For example, segregation caused by gerrymandered school lines can be undone by rezoning; or, separation due to homogeneous grouping can be eliminated by heterogeneous grouping. Subsequently, intervention strategies of this type are not new and should be no surprise to most educators. More intervention strategies of this type follow below.

However, even though intervention strategies of this type will discontinue segregation of minority students, instructional practices in desegregated classrooms which will produce positive self-images, equal social interaction, and academic growth of both white and culturally-different students are not yet known. Development of this second type of intervention strategies is discussed in the next section of this paper.

A third type of intervention strategy will not be discussed because of the complexity of the issue. Finance of public schools and the distribution of collected resources has resulted for minority students in old school structures, lack of instructional equipment and material, overcrowded classrooms, and split day sessions. Equal educational opportunity based on a fair and adequate finance scheme is very much beyond the scope of this paper.

Since segregation, desegregation, and resegregation practices are the result of intentional and unintentional human action, it is critical that initial intervention strategies be concentrated on the education of professional personnel. Clearly, the focus of corrective

action must begin at the university and college preparatory programs for teachers and administrators of public schools. The obvious actions must be realized early so as to forestall current discriminatory practices. First, a sizeable number of Spanish-surname individuals will have to be actively recruited as potential teachers and administrators. But recruitment into teacher and administrator certification programs is not enough. Preparation in the traditional manner causes some Spanish-surname teachers to act towards Hispanic students in the same inadequate way as white teachers.[38] Therefore, college training courses will have to be redesigned so as to help both the neophyte and the experienced teacher to develop curriculum suitable for Latino students. It is assumed that curriculum content which elevates the student's culture to the proper respect level will reduce boredom and arouse interest in learning. Experimenting with instructional techniques which hold promise of being compatible with the learning styles of Hispanic children will also foster greater interest and learning. In like manner, administrator preparation must be redirected in order to make principals instructional leaders, rather than school managers as is presently the case. For example, they should be functional in systematic classroom observation so as to identify for teachers their destructive discipline cycles, enabling the principal to cooperatively plan with the teacher alternative ways to minimize classroom disruptions. Such administrative competency will go a long way to reduce teachers' mislabeling children as "troublemakers," in turn lowering the suspension rate of minority students.

School trustees will have to be forceful about complying with affirmative action policies in promotion of the traditionally excluded minorities. School district superintendents will have to institute a promotion procedure which embraces selection based on matching the individual's merits to job-related criteria.

Additionally, intervention strategies should revolve around the practices of testing and grouping. Both the long and short range problems and ill effects created by standardized testing of minority

children have been uncovered to a degree warranting a moratorium on its use for minority students. The National Education Association, at its 1972 annual convention, passed a resolution calling for the "elimination of group standardized intelligence, aptitude, and achievement tests to assess student potential or achievement."[39] Concurrently, researchers need to be supported financially to develop test instruments and procedures which are culturally representative of students. Testing agencies such as Educational Testing Service should form teams of experts to design and devise test items and processes that are culturally fair for the culturally-different student. School districts must mount an all-out effort to build criterion reference tests. Principals must aid their teaching staff to install individualized instruction. Personalizing the instruction to each student makes homogeneous grouping obsolete. Tracking of students based on instructional purposes can be continued, but a structured procedure facilitating in-progress assessment of the student's development must be incorporated. In this way, entrance and exit can be frequent and valid.

Minority student suspension and corporal punishment can be reduced to a substantial level by review and alteration of school disciplinary policy. School district reports indicate that more intensive and extensive parental involvement in school affairs lowers the amount of school vandalism and student truancy. More recommendations bringing reason to school suspensions are offered in Chapter Six of *School Suspensions: Are They Helping Children?*

Finally, the mixing of all students must be constant and continuous; sorting should be based on valid criteria. For the segregation of students is more pervasive than separation founded on racism. Scheduling of students based on age, sex, grade level, composite test scores, and superficial teacher judgment have proved to be devisive and not pedagogically helpful. The entire practice of channeling students indiscriminately must be attacked. Assignment of students based on diagnostic procedures, demonstrated performance, accurately measured aptitude, genuine interest, special skills, physical handicaps, and coupled to instructional activities and appropriate student ineraction

will go towards building strong self-concepts and social acceptance of diversity. Under this new, wider range of criteria for student placement, English-speaking students should and can enroll in bilingual classes, Chicanos can take Black studies courses, students who are minimally physically impaired can participate in industrial shop classes, and girls can take part in traditional boys' team sports. Only after educators intermingle students based on varying interest, learning styles, maturation, and personalities will segregation of students based on racial and ethnic discrimination disappear from America's public schools.

In summary, the above strategies are well known and the implementation manageable, but the compliance to these strategies by responsible school authorities, as of yet, is still resisted.

V. Research: Directional Focus

A review of the research and literature on desegregation reveals numerous studies directed at symptoms resulting from some form of desegregation implementation. Studies of this type can best be characterized by mentioning the key aspects investigated, such as white flight, landmark legal decisions, minority student suspension, racial violence in schools, and inequity in school facilities. Researchers undertaking such studies are among the better known, e.g., Coleman,[40] Falnnery,[41] and Gliger.[42]

More recently, desegregation studies have been directed at the means creating resegregation. Studies that illustrate how desegregated schools continue to separate minority children from others have focused on social interaction, tracking, and ability grouping, standardized tests, and student suspension. Such research has been undertaken by Epps,[43] Findley,[44] the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, and Hall.[45] While this latter category of research begins to coalesce into the essence of developing integrated schools, still the findings are tangential to producing intervening strategies which will establish integrated schools. Since these researchers have been acutely aware

of the highly sensitive nature of desegregation, they have approached it from a policy-making and political standpoint.

There is a third category of studies, classroom instruction, that goes to the center of the desegregation target, but such studies are few in number. For the most part, the few studies directed at classroom instruction are focused on student achievement.[46] Also, while the studies point to formulation of intervening strategies, they do not contain specifically-stated means that will establish integrated learning institutions. The only general conclusions[47] drawn from studies of achievement are: (1) The learning rate of desegregated minority pupils as measured by standardized achievement tests has not been improved in any clear or consistent way. (2) There is virtually no evidence that indicates desegregation hurts achievement of white or minority pupils. Nor does it show any different effects according to the type of desegregation — voluntary or involuntary, with or without bussing. (3) There are some indications that achievement gains occur most often when minority youngsters are desegregated in kindergarten or first grade rather than when they are older. The other few remaining studies in this last category concentrate on student status and expectations about self and others.

What is being proposed is the starting of a fourth major category with the bull's eye being the classroom of a desegregated school. Scrutiny must be on teacher actions, planned learning activities, and administrative support systems at the school and at the district office. Only by observing systematically the day-to-day school and classroom environment where children learn can we begin to eradicate the exposed excesses of racial intraschool isolation, minority student expulsion, etc. But beyond eradication, such concentrated studies will help to enhance academic achievement and social interaction of students on an equal basis.

Future research must concentrate on discovering and uncovering positive learning strategies beneficial to racially and culturally mixed classrooms in desegregated schools. Specifically, questions to be investigated for development are:

(1) What planned activities are necessary in integrated classrooms which will foster positive affective relationships between teacher/student and student/student and concurrently promote cognitive growth within minority students?

(2) What conditions need to be established throughout the school to enhance productive adjustments for all involved, i.e., students, staff, and parents?

(3) What arrangements need to be implemented at the school building level that will facilitate, support, and promote classroom efforts of racial and cultural acceptance?

It should be noted that the above questions are basic and directly related to the fundamental constructs of formal schooling. That is to say, institutionalized education can be divided into two theoretical constructs, structure and function. Structure is defined as the formal relationships between prescribed organization roles. Function is defined as the tasks, duties, and actions that must be performed to accomplish the expressed goals of the organization. Reform of any formal organization's operation can only result if one or both these fundamental constructs are altered. Thus, question (1) is fundamental in nature and question (3) is structural; question (2) includes both.

The anticipated product of investigating the above three comprehensive questions is the formulation of instructional strategies conducive to fostering affective and cognitive growth for both minority students and others. A second stage beyond this discovery phase is required. Field testing the instructional practices formulated by first phase research efforts will yield data necessary to revise pedagogical practices that when performed by teachers in desegregated classrooms will go towards forming compatible teacher/student and peer relationships and supporting learning habits of minority students.

The National Institute of Education must commit itself by sponsoring research to attack questions aimed at classroom instructional practices promoting academic and social equality among all students. If headway is to be made in overcoming public resistance to desegregation and true integration of public schools is to be reached, then technical knowledge will have to be generated and implemented.

References

1. John H. Burma, editor, *Mexican Americans in the United States*, New York: Harper and Row, 1970.

2. Cary McWilliams, *North from Mexico*, New York: Greenwood Press, 1968. (See, in particular, Chapters 11 - 14.)

3. U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Mexican Americans and the Administration of Justice in the Southwest*, Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, Report I, March 1970.

4. Leo Grebler, Joan W. Moore, and Ralph C. Guzman, *The Mexican American People*. New York: The Free Press, 1970.

5. Cabinet Committee Hearings, *The Mexican American: A New Focus on Opportunity*, Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1968. See also *Civil Rights Digest*, a quarterly of the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights.

6. Thomas P. Carter, *Mexican Americans in Schools: A History of Educational Neglect*, New Jersey: College Entrance Examination Board, 1970, p. 67.

7. Henry W. Cooke, "The Segregation of Mexican American School Children in Southern California," *School and Society*, Vol. 67, No. 1745, June 5, 1948, p. 417.

8. U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Ethnic Isolation of Mexican Americans in the Public Schools of the Southwest*, Report I, April 1971, p. 12.

9. National Association of Intergroup Relations, "Public School Segregation and Integration in the North," *Journal of Intergroup Relations*, Vol. 1, 1963.

10. *Independent School District v. Salvatierra*, 33 SW 2nd 790 (Texas Civ. App., San Antonio, 1930).

11. Texas Attorney General Opinion No. V-128 (1948), reported in J. C. Hinsley, *Texas School Law*, 1109 (4th edition), 1968.

12. *Mendez v. Westminister School District*, 64 F. Supp. 544 (San Diego, California 1946).

13. *Delago v. Bastrop Independent School District*, Civil Action No. 388 (W. D. Texas, June 15, 1948).

14. *Romero v. Weakley*, 131 F. Supp. 818, 820 (San Diego, California 1955).

15. *Keys v. School District Number One,* 313 F. Supp. 66 (Denver, Colorado 1970).

16. *Cisneros v. Corpus Christi Independent School District,* Civil Action No. 68-C-95 (S. D. Texas, June 4, 1970).

17. Uvaldo H. Palomares, editor, *Educational Testing, Is the Deck Stacked?* Journal of Association of Mexican American Educators, Inc., Vol. 1, No. 1, May 1973.

18. U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Towards Quality Education for Mexican Americans,* Report VI, February 1974, p. 28.

19. Guadalupe Salinas, "Mexican Americans and the Desegregation of Schools in the Southwest," *Houston Law Review,* Vol. 8, No. 929, 1971, p. 948.

20. *Towards Quality Education for Mexican Americans, op. cit.,* pp. 21-22.

21. Children's Defense Fund, *School Suspensions: Are They Helping Children?* Cambridge, Mass.: Washington Research Project, 1975, p. 13.

22. *Ibid.*

23. *Ibid.,* p. 71.

24. U. S. Department of Commerce, *General Social and Economic Characteristics: 1970 Census of the Population,* Washington, D. C.: Bureau of the Census, PC (1)-C1, Table 88.

25. Children's Defense Fund, *op. cit.,* p. 61.

26. Children's Defense Fund, *Children Out of School in America,* Cambridge, Mass.: Washington Research Project, 1974, p. 136.

27. *School Suspensions: Are They Helping Children?, op. cit.,* p. 70.

28. *Ethnic Isolation of Mexican Americans in the Public Schools of the Southwest, op. cit.,* p. 41.

29. *Ibid.,* p. 45.

30. *Ibid.,* p. 49.

31. Francis Mascaro, "The Early On-the-Job Socialization of First Year Elementary School Principals," Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Riverside, 1973.

32. Howard S. Becker and Anselm Strauss, "Careers, Personality, and Adult Socialization," *The American Journal of Sociology*, LXII (November 1956), p. 254.

33. Edgar Schein, "Organizational Socialization and the Profession of Management," *Behavioral Decisions in Organizations*, Alvar Elbing, ed., Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman, & Co., 1970, p. 606.

34. Leonard A. Valverde, "Succession Socialization: Its Influence on School Administrative Candidates and Its Implication to the Exclusion of Minorities from Administration," *ERIC*, ED. 093 052, November 1974.

35. John and Gail McLure, "The Case of the Vanishing Women," *UCEA Review*, Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, Vol. XVI, No. 1, September 1974, p. 6.

36. Daniel Griffiths, *et al.*, *Teacher Mobility in New York City*, New York: Center for School Services and Off-Campus Courses, New York University, 1963.

37. Ronald Blood, "The Functions of Experience in Professional Preparation," Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Claremont Graduate School, 1966.

38. U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Teachers and Students: Difference in Teacher Interaction with Mexican American and Anglo Students*, Report V, March 1973, p. 27.

39. National Education Association, "Resolutions and Other Actions," Atlantic City: NEA Publications, July 1972, p. 36.

40. James Coleman, "Recent Trends in School Integration," *Educational Researcher*, June 1975, pp. 3 - 12.

41. Harold J. Flannery, "The Role of the Courts in Educational Change," *Intergroup*, Western Regional School Desegregation Projects, University of California, Riverside, June 1972.

42. Odis Gliger, *Effects of Desegregation in Classroom Achievement*, University of South Carolina, 1968.

43. Edgar G. Epps, "Impact of School Desegregation on Aspirations, Self-Concepts and Other Aspects of Personality," *Law and Contemporary Problems, The Courts, Social Science, and School Desegregation Part II*, Law School, Duke University, Spring 1975.

44. Warren Findley and Miriam Bryan, *Ability Grouping 1970 — Status, Impact and Alternatives*, Center for Educational Improvement, University of Georgia, January 1971.

45. Leon Hall, "Race and Suspension: A Second Generation Problem," *Southern Regional Council,* Atlanta, Georgia, April 24, 1975.

46. Nancy St. John, *School Desegregation Outcomes for Children,* New York: Wiley Interscience Publication, 1975.

47. Jack McCurdy, "Results of School Integration: A Muddled Picture," *Los Angeles Times,* December 17, 1975, p. 3.

APPENDIX

TABLE I

Spanish-Surname Enrollment
in Public Schools by Region†

Region	Total Number of Students	Number of Spanish-Surname Students	Percent
Northeast	9,389,990	347,263	3.7
North Central	12,389,250	150,687	1.2
South	11,308,849	67,341	0.6
Southwest	8,144,330	1,397,586	17.2
West	2,121,152	39,897	1.9
U.S. Total	43,353,567††	2,002,776	4.6

†SOURCE: Fall 1968 HEW Title VI Survey in *Ethnic Isolation of Mexican Americans in the Public Schools of the Southwest.* U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, Report I, April 1971.

††The 1974 - 1975 U. S. School enrollment total was 41.4 million as reported by the National Institute of Education.

NOTE: The reader is reminded that these figures are deflated due to high drop out rate, expulsion rate and non-enrollment of Spanish-surname children. Documentation of this point will be provided in the section entitled "Student Expulsion" in this paper.

TABLE II

Population Distribution of Spanish Surname by Origin and by Region†

Region	Total Population	Spanish Surname				
		Total	Chicano	Puerto Rican	Cuban	Other††
Northeast	49,040,703	1,895,218	44,774	1,162,972	175,151	512,321
North Central	56,571,663	1,048,507	375,247	134,423	32,837	506,000
South	62,795,360	2,761,987	1,699,197	63,944	282,624	716,217
West	34,804,193	3,367,525	2,413,334	68,325	54,010	831,856
U. S.	203,211,926	9,073,237	4,532,552	1,429,664	544,627	2,566,394
Percent	100%	4%	2%	.07%	.02%	1%
	%	100%	50%	15 %	6 %	29%

†SOURCE: U. S. Department of Commerce, *Persons of Spanish Ancestry: 1970 Census of Population* Washington, D. C.: Bureau of the Census, PC (SI) - 30, February 1973, Table I, "Persons of Spanish Origin for Region, Divisions, and States: 1970," p. 1.

††Includes Latin Americans, Central Americans, Filipinos, and Portuguese.

NOTE: Census figures above are based on sample survey; thus the numbers are underestimations of actual population due to faulty category identification and inadequate survey procedures, e.g., English-only survey forms were used.

TABLE VII

Percentage of Disciplinary Action Compared to Percentage of Minority Student Enrollment, Austin ISD 1974 - 1975†

Level	Black	Chicano	White
ELEMENTARY			
Enrollment	16.10	24.76	59.14
Students Disciplined	29.61	21.03	49.35
SIXTH GRADE			
Enrollment	14.58	16.36	69.06
Students Disciplined	43.03	35.15	21.81
JUNIOR HIGH			
Enrollment	15.13	24.42	60.44
Students Disciplined	41.57	22.23	36.20
SENIOR HIGH			
Enrollment	12.89	17.43	69.69
Students Disciplined	39.43	26.15	34.42

†SOURCE: **Discipline Report** prepared by Department of Student Development, **Austin Independent School District for** 1974 - 1975 school year, Table XI, Attachment U-2 **and** U-3.